## Case 1:96-cv-05238-MKB-JO Document 1326 Filed 09/29/06 Page 1 of 2 PageID #: 4187

## SIMPSON THACHER & BARTLETT LLP

425 LEXINGTON AVENUE New York, N.Y. 10017-3954 (212) 455-2000

FACSIMILE: (212) 455-2502

DIRECT DIAL NUMBER

212-455-3840

E-MAIL ADDRESS

jtringali@stblaw.com

September 29, 2006

Re:

In re Visa Check/MasterMoney Antitrust Litigation

Master File No. CV-96-5238

Honorable John F. Gleeson United States District Judge **United States District Court** Eastern District of New York 225 Cadman Plaza East Brooklyn, New York 11201

Dear Judge Gleeson:

We represent MasterCard International Incorporated ("MasterCard") in the above-referenced action and are writing on behalf of MasterCard and Visa U.S.A. Inc. ("Visa") to respond to the questions posed by the Court on September 11, 2006 with regard to the pending application by the Government Merchants.

First, MasterCard and Visa have no objection to Special Master Wilcox conducting settlement discussions to attempt to reach an amicable resolution of the Government Merchants' application. While the parties have had limited settlement discussions without the participation of Special Master Wilcox, those discussions did not lead to any resolution.

Second, MasterCard and Visa believe that Special Master Wilcox's Report and Recommendation should remain under seal while the settlement discussions are conducted because it is likely that knowing the recommendation of the Special Master will make the prospect of any settlement less likely. Some degree of uncertainty and risk would

Los Angeles PALO ALTO Case 1:96-cv-05238-MKB-JO Document 1326 Filed 09/29/06 Page 2 of 2 PageID #: 4188 SIMPSON THACHER & BARTLETT LLP

Honorable John F. Gleeson

-2-

September 29, 2006

remain even if the Special Master's recommendation were known because of the possibility of a reversal by this Court or by the Second Circuit, as well as the possibility of a claim for reformation by the Settling Defendants in the event that the Government Merchants' application were denied and they brought a separate action against the defendants. However, clearly the prevailing party in the Special Master's recommendation would believe it faced less uncertainty and risk than before it knew the Special Master's recommendation, and thus would be less likely to settle on the same terms to which it would have likely agreed prior to learning the Special Master's recommendation.

Respectfully,

Joseph F. Tringali

cc: Stephen V. Bomse, Esq. Lloyd Constantine, Esq. John R. Read, Esq, Allen P. Grunes, Esq.